In denying Plaintiffs' motion yesterday to change the June 11, 2007 preliminary injunction hearing to June 12, 2007, the Court indicated that it was available to conduct the hearing on June 7, 2007, and that if the parties agreed to hold the hearing on that date, the Court would sign a stipulated order to that effect.

Yesterday evening, Plaintiffs asked Defendant to stipulate to the June 7, 2007 hearing date, which is the date *Defendant* proposed for the preliminary injunction hearing in its May 29, 2007 motion to change time. Decl. of Stephen P. Berzon at ¶8-9 & Exh. 2. As set forth in the Berzon Declaration, Mr. Berzon will cancel the earlier, Honolulu portion of his trip on June 6 and 7, 2007, and serve as Plaintiffs' lead counsel on June 7, 2007. Mr. Berzon cannot be available on June 11, 2007, however, because the latter, Hana portion of his trip has been scheduled for approximately nine months in connection with the celebration of his 40th wedding anniversary. *See Id.* at ¶5.

This morning, Defendant denied Plaintiffs' request on the ground that it wants "to space out" the hearings, and could not agree to a June 7 preliminary injunction hearing date because that was too close to the June 5 transfer motion hearing date. *Id.* ¶9 & Exh. 2.

Plaintiffs therefore now have no option but to file this motion to change time and request that the Court set the preliminary injunction hearing on June 7, 2007.

Defendant previously indicated at the hearing on May 24, 2007 that it was *critical* to hold the preliminary injunction time at the *earliest* possible time. Moreover, on May 26, 2007, Defendant proposed to Plaintiffs' counsel that the motion to transfer be heard on June 4 and the preliminary injunction on June 6 – a mere two days apart. *Id.* Exh. 1. This is the same two day spread between hearings that Defendant now claims is too close.

Defendant then proposed to the Court in its May 29, 2007 Motion to Change Time that the transfer motion be heard on June 4 and the preliminary injunction be heard the same week on June 7. Doc. No. 48 (Def's Mot. to Change Time) at 1. Yet Defendant now contends that June 7, the very date it proposed for the preliminary injunction hearing, places the two hearings too close together. Its sudden rejection of its own proposed preliminary injunction hearing date can only be driven by a tactical desire to have the preliminary injunction hearing take place without Plaintiffs' lead counsel. This Court should not countenance Defendant's tactical maneuvering and prejudice

	Case 3:07-cv-02688-CRB	Document 71	Filed 05/31/2007	Page 3 of 3
1	Plaintiffs' presentation of their	case.		
2	Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request that the Court issue an amended scheduling order re-			
3	calendaring the preliminary injunction for June 7, 2007.			
4	carendaring the premimary inju	metion for June 7,	2007.	
5				
6	Dated: May 31, 2007	Respectfully	submitted	
7	Buttur May 51, 2007	respectany	Succinition .	
8		STEPHEN F LINDA LYF		
9		CLAIRE P. I Altshuler Be	PRESTEL	
10	ELIZABETH GINSBURG			
11			ots Association, Interna	ntional
12		bv: \s\Stenl	nen P. Berzon	
13		Stepl	nen P. Berzon	
14		Attorneys fo	r Plaintiffs	
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				

28